BY ORDER OF THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE INSTRUCTION 14-2PR, VOLUME 2

5 DECEMBER 2013

Intelligence

PERSONNEL RECOVERY (PR) UNIT INTELLIGENCE EVALUATION CRITERIA

COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

ACCESSIBILITY: Publications and forms are available for download on the e-Publishing website at **www.e-Publishing.af.mil.**

RELEASABILITY: There are no releasability restrictions on this publication.

OPR: ACC/A2

Certified by: AF/A2D
(Brig Gen Donald J. Bacon)
Pages: 16

This publication implements Air Force Policy Directive (AFPD) 14-2, *Intelligence Rules and Procedures*, and is consistent with Air Force Instruction (AFI) 14-202, Volume 1, *Intelligence Training*, AFI 14-202 Volume 2, *Intelligence Standardization/Evaluation Program*, and AFI 14-202, Volume 3, *General Intelligence Rules*. This publication establishes the minimum Air Force standards for evaluating and qualifying personnel performing intelligence duties in PR units. This publication applies to Active Duty, Reserve and Air National Guard (ANG) intelligence personnel supporting PR operations. National Guard Bureau will be considered functionally as a major command (MAJCOM) for the purposes of this publication. This publication requires the collection or maintenance of information protected by the Privacy Act of 1974. Privacy Act System of Records Notice F036 AF PC C, Military Personnel Records System, covers required information. The authority to maintain the records prescribed in this instruction are Title 10 U.S.C. §8013, *Secretary of the Air Force*; as implemented by AFI 36-2608, *Military Personnel Records System*, and AFI 14-202, and Executive Order 9397, *Numbering System for Federal Accounts Relating To Individual Persons*, as amended by Executive Order 13478, *Amendments to Executive Order 9397 Relating to Federal Agency Use of Social Security Numbers*. Ensure all records created as a result of processes prescribed in this publication are maintained in accordance with (IAW) Air Force Manual (AFMAN) 33-363, *Management of Records*, and disposed of IAW with the Air Force Records Disposition Schedule located in the Air Force Records Information Management System. This publication may be supplemented, but all supplements must be coordinated with the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) prior to certification and approval. Refer recommended changes to the OPR using the AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*. Route AF Forms 847 through the appropriate MAJCOM functional chain of command. Air Combat Command (ACC) Directorate of Intelligence (A2) is the waiver authority for this publication. Units will request waivers through

applicable MAJCOM/A2 channels. Units may request waivers for tiered compliance items IAW AFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*. In order for units to have time to prepare for compliance, this publication becomes effective 60 days after the publication date.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. General.

1.1.1. Scope. This volume provides the guidance for the PR intelligence standardization and evaluation program. Together with the cited references, it establishes the procedures and criteria for evaluating intelligence personnel during the knowledge and task phases of initial and periodic evaluations. These procedures are the minimum and can be supplemented with unit-level written guidance. Unit-level guidance will not be less restrictive.

1.1.2. References. The primary references for supporting PR intelligence evaluations are AFI 14-2PR Volume 1, *Personnel Recovery* (*PR) Unit Intelligence Training*; AFI 14-2PR Volume 3, *Personnel Recovery (PR) Unit Intelligence Procedures*; Air Force Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures (AFTTP) 3-1.General Planning, *General Planning and Employment Considerations*; AFTTP 3-1.Threat Guide, *Threat Reference Guide and Countertactics Manual*; AFTTP 3-1.HC-130, *Tactical Employment—HC-130*; AFTTP 3-1.HH-60G, *Tactical Employment—HH60G*; and AFTTP 3-1.Guardian Angel, *Tactical Employment—Guardian Angel*.

1.2. Waivers. ACC/A2 will notify AF/A2DF of significant trends in waiver correspondence if such correspondence indicates the need to readdress existing policy and guidance. MAJCOMs will courtesy-copy ACC/A2 regarding all waiver requests and responses.

1.3. Procedures.

1.3.1. Conduct and document evaluations IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. Prior to any formal evaluation conducted by a qualified Intelligence Evaluator (IE), the examinee must have successfully completed all duty position required Mission Qualification Training (MQT) or Specialized Training (ST) requirements outlined in AFI 14-2PR, Volume 1. (T-2)

1.3.2. Evaluations should be accomplished in a realistic training environment and in conjunction with local events (e.g., actual deployment briefing or post-mission debrief) to the maximum extent possible. When it is impossible to conduct evaluations in a realistic environment, use an alternate method (e.g., simulated, staged, or verbal examination). Document the reasons for and type of alternate method used in the comments section of the AF Form 4350, *Certificate of Intelligence Qualification*. (T-3)

1.3.3. Intelligence evaluators will use the evaluation criteria contained in Chapter 3 for conducting intelligence evaluations. To ensure standard and objective evaluations, IEs will be thoroughly familiar with the prescribed evaluation criteria. (T-2)

1.3.4. The IE will brief the examinee on the conduct, purpose, requirements and applicable criteria of the evaluation. The examinee will accomplish required planning IAW the task being evaluated. (T-3)

1.3.5. The IE will compare examinee performance for each area accomplished during the evaluation with the evaluation criteria provided in this volume and assign an appropriate evaluation grade for the area. Based on a composite of these individual area/sub-area grades, the IEs will determine the overall qualification level. (T-3)

1.3.6. The IE will use the AF Form 4381, *Intelligence Gradesheet*, to assist in grading the individual areas during the evaluation. The form used by the evaluator will be a blank AF Form 4381, not the one completed by the trainer during MQT/ST. The gradesheet elements specific to PR intelligence tasks are found in attachments 3 and 4 of AFI 14-2PR Volume 1. (T-3)

1.3.7. In addition to the guidance provided by this publication, IEs will be expected to use their personal experience and knowledge in the assessment of examinee performance. (T-3)

1.3.8. The IE will thoroughly debrief all aspects of the evaluation with the examinee. This debrief will include the examinee's overall rating, specific deviations, grades assigned (if other than qualified) and any required additional training. (T-3)

1.4. Additional Training. IEs are responsible for recommending additional training at their discretion. Document any additional training IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. (T-3)

1.5. Unsatisfactory Performance. Examinees receiving an overall qualification level 3 ("Q-3") will be placed in supervised status until recommended additional training is completed and/or a reevaluation is successfully accomplished. If an examinee receives a "Q-3" on an evaluation, they will not perform duties related to the evaluated task unsupervised until remedial actions are accomplished. (T-2)

Chapter 2

EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

2.1. General. The intelligence evaluation must include the areas listed in this chapter as they relate to the examinee's duty position and as depicted in Table 2.1, Intelligence Evaluations. (T-2)

Table 2.1. Intelligence Evaluations.

SUBJECT	INT MSN	MSN	EIT	IE
Knowledge Evaluations				
PR Weapon Systems Academics	R	R	---	---
Threat Knowledge	R	R	---	---
Friendly and Neutral Weapons Systems	R	R	---	---
Visual Recognition (VR)	R	R	---	---
PR	R	R	---	---
Combat Search and Rescue (CSAR) Fundamentals	R	R	---	---
Civil Search and Rescue (SAR)/Humanitarian Assistance (HA) Fundamentals	R	R	---	---
Force Protection Intelligence (FPI)	R	R	---	---
Performance Task Evaluations				
Threat Briefings	R	R	---	---
Situation Displays	R	R	---	---
Manual Order of Battle (OB)	R	R	---	---
Automated OB	R	R	---	---
Initial Situation Briefing	R	R	---	---
Situation Briefing	R	R	---	---
Changeover Briefing	R	R	---	---
Deployment Briefing	R	R	---	---
Air Tasking Order (ATO)/Air Coordination Order (ACO)/Special Instructions (SPINS) and Other Tasking Documents	R	R	---	---
Intelligence Support to Mission Planning	R	R	---	---
Mission Folder Construction	R	R	---	---
Mission Briefing	R	R	---	---
Alert Briefing	R	R	---	---
Step Briefing	R	R	---	---
Mission Tracking	R	R	---	---
Debriefing	R	R	---	---
Intelligence Reports	R	R	---	---
Specialized Task Evaluations				
Instructional Ability	---	---	R	---
Evaluator Ability	---	---	---	R
Notes: Gradesheet templates for each area are included in AFI14-2PR, Volume 1. Passing criteria for				

any knowledge evaluation is 85% of answers correct. R = Required area of evaluation INIT MSN = Initial Mission Qualification Evaluation MSN = Mission Qualification Evaluation EIT = External Intelligence Trainer Qualification Evaluation IE = Intelligence Evaluator Qualification Evaluation

2.2. Intelligence Mission Qualification Evaluations.

2.2.1. Knowledge Evaluations. Conduct knowledge evaluations as part of the initial and periodic mission qualification evaluations to test the examinee's knowledge of PR weapon systems and capabilities, threat knowledge, friendly and neutral weapon systems, VR, PR, CSAR, Civil SAR, and FPI. Examinees will complete a test from the unit's master question file (MQF) for knowledge evaluation areas. Examinees will take a separate VR test. Research, analysis and dissemination and intelligence preparation of the operational environment (IPOE) involve knowledge intelligence personnel should be applying throughout all areas of the evaluation and will be evaluated as subsets of each applicable graded area. (T-2)

2.2.2. Performance Evaluations. Use MAJCOM/A2 and/or unit-developed evaluation materials based on current intelligence, unit tasking and area of responsibility (AOR) scenarios. Units must apply operational risk management principles to evaluations conducted during exercises or deployments. The following guidelines assist the IE in conducting performance evaluations. (T-2)

2.2.2.1. Situation displays. Evaluate the examinee's ability to use intelligence systems to construct, post, update, and maintain quality situation displays based on unit mission and Operations Plan (OPLAN)/Concept of Operations Plan (CONPLAN) tasking. Determine the examinee's decision-making abilities to choose the best medium to use to create the display. Include a large variety of items from AFI 14-2PR, Volume 3 that challenges the examinee to conduct research and analysis to determine the relevance of the data to the situation. The number of items to plot should be of sufficient volume to be challenging, yet not so overwhelming that the time taken is beyond that necessary to determine proficiency. The scenario may include erroneous information to mirror the "fog of war" by including intentionally incorrect coordinates or types of threats for the particular AOR, thereby allowing the IE to assess the examinee's ability to identify errors and question the validity of information. The examinee should use Military-Standard (MIL-STD) 2525C, Common Warfighting Symbology and US Army Field Manual (FM) 1-02/US Marine Corps Reference Publication (MCRP) 5-12A, *Operational Terms and Graphics*.

2.2.2.1.1. Manual OB. Evaluate the examinee's ability to maintain OB on situation displays without intelligence systems based on unit mission and OPLAN/CONPLAN tasking. The number of OB items in the plotting exercise will be of sufficient volume to have a variety of threats to plot to ensure correct symbology is used. The examinee must identify OB production sources for the AOR and research and analyze OB data. The examinee must be able to identify critical elements of the table of organization and equipment for the OB being used.

2.2.2.1.2. Automated OB. Evaluate the examinee's ability to maintain OB on situation displays with intelligence systems based on unit mission and OPLAN/CONPLAN tasking. The examinee must identify OB production sources for the AOR from which to pull data; research and analyze that data; and question the information's accuracy. Evaluate the examinee's ability to post and maintain OB; update and purge data to ensure quality control of the displayed. Evaluate the examinee's ability to use intelligence software applications to convert between coordinate systems.

2.2.2.2. Intelligence Briefings. Evaluated briefings include threat, initial situation, situation, changeover, deployment, mission, alert, and step briefings. Evaluate the examinee's ability to prepare and present briefings. Briefings should be assembled from information provided by the evaluator; message traffic, intelligence reports, and other intelligence materials. Other sources used to evaluate other mission areas may also be used. Evaluate the research and analysis skills related to briefing preparation.

2.2.2.3. ATO/ACO/SPINS and Other Tasking Documents. Evaluate the examinee's ability to obtain, identify, and extract applicable elements of tasking documents. Use scenario, actual contingency or exercise materials. Provide enough information that the examinee's unit is not the sole unit in the tasking mechanism. The IE will determine the examinee's ability to identify and extract unit tasking, airspace control, PR SPINS and intelligence related information from tasking documents with and without the assistance of automated tools.

2.2.2.4. Intelligence Support to Mission Planning. Evaluate the examinee's ability to provide intelligence support to mission planners. Use scenario or actual contingency/exercise materials. Evaluate the examinee's knowledge of unit mission planning process. Provide enough information to evaluate the examinee‘s ability to analyze the ATO/ACO/SPINS breakout, plot unit tasking, and derive specified and implied intelligence requirements (including mission materials). The IE will determine the examinee's ability to analyze operating area threats and terrain. Specific pieces of information should be purposefully omitted to evaluate the examinee's ability to identify intelligence gaps and any assessments of likely answers to the gaps.

2.2.2.5. Mission Folder Construction. Evaluate the examinee's ability to construct mission folders. Use scenario or actual contingency/exercise materials. The IE will determine the examinee's ability to identify and obtain geospatial information and services products to build mission materials and the use of mission planning software to construct mission folders.

2.2.2.6. Mission Tracking. Evaluate the examinee's ability to monitor mission execution and communicate with other agencies and coordination centers. Use scenario, exercise or actual contingency communication tools and agency contact information to allow examinee to follow mission execution. The IE will evaluate the examinee's ability to maintain situational awareness of ongoing missions and upcoming debriefs.

2.2.2.7. Debriefing. Evaluate the examinee's ability to plan, coordinate and conduct a post-mission debriefing. Conduct debriefing evaluations following actual flying missions whenever possible. The IE will construct inject cards or coordinate with crews to identify a particular threat scenario for the debriefings. Ensure there is enough activity to

represent the typical level of detail for a threat scenario commensurate with unit AOR tasking. Evaluate the examinee's ability to prepare appropriate sections of the debrief form/checklist; identify time-sensitive information and disseminate it appropriately and expediently. The IE will determine the examinee's ability consult appropriate post flight products, control the flow and pace of the debriefing as needed to ensure thorough and accurate information collection, and identify key points and develop intelligence by asking amplifying questions relevant to the mission. The examinee will be able to prioritize questions to focus on priority intelligence requirements and control environmental factors that distract the crew or impede the debriefing process.

2.2.2.8. Intelligence Reports. Evaluate the examinee's ability to develop and transmit mission reports and other intelligence reports. Evaluate the examinee's knowledge of theater reporting directives. The IE will determine the examinee's ability to analyze and extract information of intelligence value from in-flight reports and other aircrew-submitted formats, generate intelligence reports using computer and/or manual information systems, and validate accuracy and completeness of reports.

2.3. Specialized Qualification Evaluations.

2.3.1. External Intelligence Training (EIT) Trainer Evaluation. Evaluate the examinee's ability to apply instructional concepts and methods and provide training IAW minimum standards to fulfill EIT requirements. Use MAJCOM/A2 and/or unit-developed evaluation materials based on current intelligence, unit tasking, and AOR scenarios. Base EIT trainer evaluations on the EIT Trainer training profiles in AFI 14-2PR, Volume 1. The IE will determine the examinee's knowledge and ability to present training in each applicable profile. (T-3)

2.3.1.1. In certain circumstances it may be beneficial to qualify an individual to conduct training in more than one individual EIT event at a time. The individual must complete the specific training identified for the event and be evaluated on the task or briefing element by an IE. Document the evaluation in coordination with AF/A2 approved processes regarding online documentation. The individual must maintain currency and be reevaluated periodically for the subject matter according to AFI 14-2E-3, Volume 1. (T-2)

2.3.2. Intelligence Evaluator Evaluation. Evaluate the examinee's ability to perform intelligence evaluations. Use MAJCOM/A2 and/or unit-developed evaluation materials. Record the completion and results of evaluator evaluations on the AF Form 4350. The IE will determine the examinee's ability to describe evaluation criteria, grading procedures, and evaluation form preparation for an evaluation based on the IE training profiles in AFI 14-2PR, Volume 1. Provide scenarios for intelligence evaluations, objectivity issues, and techniques for conducting evaluations. (T-3)

Chapter 3

EVALUATION CRITERIA

3.1. General Evaluation Standards. The evaluation criteria in this chapter are divided into two sections: MQT and ST evaluation criteria. Use all sections of criteria applicable to the events performed on the evaluation. (T-2)

3.2. Mission Qualification Evaluation Criteria. The following evaluation criteria apply to tasks associated with the duty positions or work centers in which personnel maintain mission qualifications.

Table 3.1. Mission Qualification Evaluation Criteria.

KNOWLEDGE EVALUATION	
Q	Correctly answered at least 85% of questions in a test based on MQF.
Q-	Not applicable for knowledge evaluations
U	Failed to answer at least 85% of the questions correctly.
VISUAL RECOGNITION	
Q	Correctly identified 85% of all items in VR test.
Q-	Not applicable.
U	Failed to identify correctly at least 85% of all items in VR test.
SITUATION DISPLAYS (Includes Manual and Automated OB)	
Q	Used checklists and followed local procedures. Correctly determined the proper medium, including type and scale, for creating the best situation display. Researched and analyzed data for accuracy, inconsistencies, and relevance to the situation. Used manual and automated processes to accurately plot all threats/items within 0.5nm of center point of coordinates. Consistently used correct symbology IAW MIL-STD-2525C and FM 1-02/MCRP 5-12A. Correctly extracted proper coordinates. Plotted to appropriate level of detail with respect to unit requirements. Successfully downloaded, printed, exported and displayed data. Able to manipulate data, display appropriate threat rings and perform terrain masking analysis. Demonstrated ability to convert various coordinate formats. Accurately maintained situation display to unit specifications, including classification and currency. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Did not select the absolute best medium for creating the situation display. Did not fully research and analyze data resulting in some minor irrelevant items to be included. Plotted 95% of the data within 0.5nm of center point of coordinates, the remaining 5% within 1nm. Minor inconsistencies in symbology, corrected with little prompting. Needed little assistance with coordinate conversions.
U	Failed to use checklist and follow local procedures. Errors would have significantly impacted mission success. Unable to identify errors or inconsistencies in data. Unable to complete tasks without significant supervision or intervention. Incorrect classification.
INTELLIGENCE BRIEFINGS	
Q	Used checklists and followed local procedures. Briefing well organized and professionally presented in a logical sequence. Appropriate level of detail and covered

	all applicable items. Effective use of visual aids. Concise yet thorough delivery. Demonstrated ability to identify gaps in information that had potential impact on the mission. Demonstrated knowledge of research methods, information sources, and IPOE concepts. Showed ability to discriminate irrelevant information. Provided detailed information tailored to the audience. Demonstrated knowledge of capabilities and limitations of unit assets when conducting analysis. Fielded questions correctly. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Minor omissions, recovered when prompted with no significant impact on mission. Needs improvement in organization or delivery. Briefing hard to follow, somewhat redundant.
U	Failed to use checklist and follow local procedures. Content poorly organized, confusing, and key areas omitted. Significant lack of analytical ability. Unable to conduct basic research. Poor knowledge of IPOE concepts. Missed significant information or failed to disseminate information to proper audience. Poor knowledge of capabilities/limitations of unit assets and/or the impact information may have. Negative impact on the mission. Fabricated information. Unable to accurately field questions. Incorrect classification.
ATO/ACO/SPINS AND OTHER TASKING DOCUMENTS	
Q	Used checklists and followed local procedures. Accessed correct tasking documents and any changes. Correctly determined unit tasking, airspace control, PR information and intelligence related information. Able to breakout unit tasking from tasking documents using manual and automated techniques and tools. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Some errors or delays in extracting information that did not jeopardize or impact mission planning timeline. Accomplished tasks but needed minimal assistance.
U	Failed to use checklists and follow local procedures. Errors, omissions or delays in extracting information that could have affected mission planning. Unable to accomplish tasks without significant intervention. Incorrect classification.
INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO MISSION PLANNING	
Q	Used checklists and followed local procedures. Knowledgeable on PR mission planning processes. Used appropriate research and analysis techniques in reviewing the ATO/ACO/SPINS and derive specified and implied intelligence requirements. Correctly identified and plotted unit tasking. Effectively analyzed operating area threats and terrain; and coordinate with operations to recommend mission routes. Recognized information gaps and assessed likely answers to the gaps. Mission planning situation briefing was effectively organized and professionally presented. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Required some assistance, but no impact on mission planning functions. Some difficulty with use of mission materials. Minor omission of information or errors that did not seriously impact mission planning. Mission planning situation briefing could be better prepared or organized. Able to recover with minor prompting.
U	Failed to use checklists or follow local procedures. Poorly organized or unprepared to support mission planning. Made errors or omissions that could have prevented an effective mission. Displayed faulty or limited knowledge of factors relevant to the mission. Improper use of mission planning tools or materials. Significant lack of analytical ability. Unable to conduct basic research. Poor knowledge of capabilities

	or limitations of unit assets may have negative impact on the mission. Poor organization or lack of preparation seriously affected audience understanding of the mission planning situation briefing. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
MISSION FOLDER CONSTRUCTION	
Q	Used checklists and followed local procedures. Demonstrated knowledge and proper use of mission planning materials. Accurate portrayal of objective threats and hazards as well as ingress and egress factors to consider. Tailored mission materials to the type of mission being planned and target/objective area. Provided all mission materials in correct quantities and of sufficient detail. Materials neat and well organized. Considered all factors that could impact successful mission accomplishment. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Errors or minor omissions in mission materials which would not preclude mission accomplishment. Minor problems in organizing mission materials. Corrected when prompted.
U	Failed to use checklists and follow local procedures. Major omissions or errors which would have affected mission. Poor knowledge of mission requirements or sources for mission materials. Chose incorrect scales or views in mission materials for target/objective area. Incorrectly plotted objective area threats. Did not know how to request information or target materials. Incorrect classification.
MISSION TRACKING	
Q	Used checklists and followed local procedures. Effectively monitored and used communication systems to maintain situational awareness of ongoing missions. Effectively communicated with other PR agencies and coordination centers and provided support to missions as necessary. Correctly logged communication with theater and national participants. Accurately tracked mission debriefings and appropriate reports. Aware of all cancelled or diverted missions. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Did not utilize resources well. Some errors or delays in communicating with other PR agencies and coordination centers. Made updates to tracking mechanism with prompting, not proactive. All personnel could not quickly derive mission status. Debriefs not completely tracked. Accomplished tasks but needed minimal assistance.
U	Failed to use checklists and follow local procedures. Errors, omissions or delays in communicating with other PR agencies and coordination centers. No mechanism for effectively updating status of missions. Completely missed an update or passed on erroneous information. Demonstrated lack of knowledge of PR mission capabilities. Unable to accomplish tasks without significant intervention. Incorrect classification.
DEBRIEFING	
Q	Used checklists and followed local procedures. Thoroughly prepared and was able to extract pertinent mission results in timely manner. Prepared appropriate sections of the debrief form/checklist prior to debrief. Assembled and brought requisite materials for use to the debriefing. Quickly identified perishable information and ensured prompt dissemination as applicable. Controlled the debriefing, asked amplifying questions, and recognized irrelevant information. Collected all significant intelligence with sufficient detail to accomplish reporting requirements. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Debriefing took too long. Somewhat redundant in questions or failed to ask some

	amplifying questions that would have enhanced detail of information gathered. Slow in dealing with time-sensitive information.
U	Failed to use checklists and follow local procedures. Not prepared, did not have materials for debrief. Disjointed flow. Failed to identify perishable information. Completely missed a debriefing. Lost control of the debriefing. Not enough detail to accomplish reporting requirements. Incorrect classification.
INTELLIGENCE REPORTS	
Q	Used checklists and followed local/theater procedures. Knowledgeable of theater reporting directives. Summarized all pertinent information available and included an initial level of tactical analysis with minimal to no extraneous info. Properly formatted. Met reporting timelines. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Missed timeline but still delivered quality intelligence report. Delay due to extenuating circumstances. Minor problems with clarity, organization or formatting but pertinent information was included.
U	Failed to use checklists and follow local/theater procedures. Did not complete report within prescribed timelines. Report was not in format required by theater reporting directive. Incomplete or inaccurate report. Writing skills confused meaning of information or omitted critical information. Incorrect dissemination. Incorrect classification.

3.3. Specialized Evaluation Criteria. The following evaluation criteria apply to tasks associated with the duty positions in which personnel maintain specialized qualifications.

Table 3.2. EIT Trainer Evaluation Criteria.

INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY	
Q	Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively. Planned training efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated and met all objectives. Tailored training to the unit's weapons systems, mission specific requirements and appropriate audience (e.g., rescue crews, security forces). Effectively fielded and accurately answered questions from audience. Demonstrated subject matter knowledge. Able to quickly retrieve answers/amplifying data from reference materials. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Deficiencies in depth of knowledge, comprehension of unit procedures, requirements, mission or threats. Minor problems in communicating or organization of instruction. Did not adversely affect training.
U	Inability to effectively communicate instruction to the audience. Did not plan training efficiently. Made poor decisions that adversely affected training. Unfamiliar with procedures, requirements, mission or threats. Lack of knowledge in certain areas seriously detracted from instructor effectiveness. Incorrect classification.

Table 3.3. Intelligence Evaluator Evaluation Criteria.

INTELLIGENCE EVALUATOR PROFICIENCY	
Q	Demonstrated ability to evaluate effectively. Planned evaluation efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated all objectives. Displayed thorough knowledge of evaluation criteria, grading procedures and evaluation documentation preparation.

	Completed appropriate evaluation records accurately. Adequately assessed and recorded performance. Comments were clear and pertinent. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Deficiencies in depth of knowledge regarding unit procedures, evaluation requirements, or documentation. Minor problems in communicating or organization of evaluation. Did not adversely affect the evaluation. Minor errors or omissions in evaluation records. Comments were incomplete or slightly unclear.
U	Inability to effectively communicate evaluation procedures to the examinee. Did not plan evaluation efficiently and/or made poor decisions that adversely affected the evaluation process. Unfamiliar with evaluation criteria, grading procedures and evaluation documentation requirements. Lack of knowledge in certain areas seriously detracted from evaluator effectiveness. Did not complete required forms or records. Comments were invalid, unclear, or did not accurately document performance. Incorrect classification.

Robert P. Otto, Lieutenant General, USAF
Deputy Chief of Staff, Intelligence,
Surveillance and Reconnaissance

Attachment 1

GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

References

AFPD 14-2, *Intelligence Rules and Procedures*, 29 November 2007

AFI 11-2HC-130, Volume 2, HC/MC-130 *Aircrew Evaluation Criteria*, 1 January 2005

AFI 11-2HH-60, Volume 2, *HH-60 Aircrew Evaluation Criteria*, 10 August 2007

AFI 14-119, *Intelligence Support to Force Protection (FP)*, 4 May 2012

AFI 14-202, Volume 1, *Intelligence Training*, 10 March 2008

AFI 14-202, Volume 2, *Intelligence Standardization/Evaluation Program*, 10 March 2008

AFI 14-202, Volume 3, *General Intelligence Rules*, 10 March 2008

AFI 14-2PR, Volume 1, *PR Unit Intelligence Training*, 5 December 2013

AFI 14-2PR, Volume 3, *PR Unit Intelligence Procedures*, 5 December 2013

AFI 36-2201, *Air Force Training Program*, 15 September 2010

AFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*, 25 September 2013

AFMAN 33-363, *Management of Records*, 1 March 2008

AFTTP 3-1.GUARDIAN ANGEL, *Tactical Employment—GUARDIAN ANGEL* 8 May 2012 (S)

AFTTP 3-1.HC-130, *Tactical Emploment—HC-130*, 2 February 2010 (S)

AFTTP 3-1.HH-60, *Tactical Employment—HH-60G*, 28 October 2011 (S)

AFTTP 3-1.Threat Guide, *Threat Reference Guide and Countertactics Manual*, 3 December 2012 (S)

MIL STD 2525C, *Common Warfighting Symbology*, 17 November 2008

FM 1-02/MCRP 5-12A, *Operational Terms and Graphics*, 21 September 2004

Adopted Forms

AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*

AF Form 4349, *Record of Intelligence Evaluation*

AF Form 4350, *Certificate of Intelligence Qualification*

AF Form 4381, *Intelligence Gradesheet*

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACC—Air Combat Command

ACO—Airspace Control Order

AFI—Air Force Instruction

AFMAN—Air Force Manual

AFPD—Air Force Policy Directive

AFTTP—Air Force Tactics, Techniques and Procedures

ANG—Air National Guard

AOR—Area of Responsibility

ATO—Air Tasking Order

CONPLAN—Concept of Operations Plan

CSAR—Combat Search and Rescue

EIT—External Intelligence Training

FM—Field Manual

FPI—Force Protection Intelligence

HA—Humanitarian Assistance

IAW—In Accordance With

IE—Intelligence Evaluator

IPOE—Intelligence Preparation of the Operational Environment

MAJCOM—Major Command

MCRP—Marine Corps Reference Publication

MQF—Master Question File

MQT—Mission Qualification Training

OB—Order of Battle

OPLAN—Operations Plan

OPR—Office of Primary Responsibility

PR—Personnel Recovery

SAR—Search and Rescue

SPINS—Special Instructions

ST—Specialized Training

T-2—Tier 2

T-3—Tier 3

VR—Visual Recognition

Terms

Tier 2 (T—2)—Non-compliance has the potential to create moderate risk of mission or program degradation or failure, injury, legal jeopardy or unacceptable fraud, waste or abuse. Waivers may be granted at the MAJCOM/CC level, but may not be delegated lower than MAJCOM Director.

Tier 3 (T—3)—Non-compliance has a relatively remote potential to create risk of mission or program degradation or failure, injury, legal jeopardy or unacceptable fraud, waste or abuse. Waivers may be granted at the Wing/DRU/FOA commander level.